

REMARKS:

5 By the foregoing amendment, Applicant responds fully to the Office Action mailed January 27, 2006. Claim 10 has been amended by the present amendment. Claims 1-9, 14-18 and 29-33 have been canceled by the present amendment. Claims 10-13 remain pending in the instant application.

 Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by
10 Garcia (USPN 3,400,408). The Examiner states, on page 4 of the Office Action, that he interprets Claim 10 as having the following: “socked (92), a first prosthetic component (90), a sleeve module (60), a spacer module (46), a second prosthetic component (20) and a foot (5).”

 Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s rendering of the Claim
15 terms. Calling attention to Figure 16 and Paragraph 0073 of the present published application, Applicant respectfully calls attention to the terms used in Claim 10. Specifically, the first prosthetic component is illustratively shown in FIG. 16 as a receiver adapter 100, the sleeve module is illustratively shown as number 60, the spacer module is illustratively shown as number 80, and the second prosthetic
20 component is illustratively shown as a three prong adapter 30.

Claim 10 has been amended by the present amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Specifically, Claim 10 has been amended to additionally recite that the sleeve module has an internal surface with
5 threads and an external surface with a clamp, and that the spacer module has an interior surface and an exterior surface with threads, wherein the clamp secures the sleeve module onto the spacer module.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art
10 reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Carbide Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).” See MPEP §2131 8th Ed., Rev. 1, (February 2003). Garcia fails to show a sleeve module having a clamp for securing the sleeve module to the spacer module. Since Garcia fails to show each and every limitation of amended Claim 10, that Claim is not anticipated by Garcia. It is
15 therefore believed that Claim 10 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garcia. Claims 11 and 12 depend from Claim 10, which is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore believed that Claims 11 and 12 are now in condition for allowance as well.

20 Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia. Claim 13 depends from Claim 10, which is now believed to be in condition for allowance. It is therefore believed that Claim 13 is now allowable as well.

In summary, Applicant responds fully to the Office Action dated January 27, 2006. Applicant believes that the present application containing claims 10-13 is in condition for allowance. Favorable action to that end respectfully requested.

5

Signed at Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, this 24 day of April, 2006.

10

Respectfully Submitted,



15

Nicholas A. Brannen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 51,224

20

104 South Main Street, Suite 300
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin 54935
Telephone: 920-322-9130
Fax: 920-322-9131
nab@brannenlawoffice.com